REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 14, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 14, 2005.

Claims 13-19 and 22-37 remain pending in the application after entry of this response. Claims 1-12 and 20-21 have been cancelled, and claims 23-37 have been added. Reconsideration of the claims pending is requested for reasons presented below.

Specification

The title of the invention has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 4, 13-14, 19, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lynde*, '666.

Lynde discloses cutting elements disposed on a cutting blade. As shown in Figures 7-13, the cutting elements have a frusto-conical shape. *Lynde* does not teach, show, or suggest a body having sides substantially perpendicular to the milling surface, as recited in claim 13, and claims depending therefrom. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4, 13-15, 19, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Neff* '952.

Neff discloses a downhole cutting tool having cutting elements which have protruding edges. *Neff* does not teach, show, or suggest sides substantially

PAGE 8/21 * RCVD AT 3/14/2005 5:51:27 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:7136234844 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-58

perpendicular to the milling surface, as recited in claim 13, and claims depending therefrom. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Brunnert,* '576. Claim 10 has been cancelled.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 5-6, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lynde* in view of *Hall.* These claims have been cancelled.

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lynde* in view of *Brunnert.* These claims have been cancelled.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lynde* in view of *Hall* and *Brunnert.* These claims have been cancelled.

Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brunnert.* These claims have been cancelled.

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lynde.* These claims have been cancelled.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

PAGE 9/21 * RCVD AT 3/14/2005 5:51:27 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:7136234844 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-58

New Claims

With respect to new claim 23 and claims depending therefrom, neither *Lynde* nor *Neff* teach, show, or suggest a body having sides substantially perpendicular to the milling surface.

With respect to claim 33 and claims depending therefrom, *Brunnert* does not teach, show, or suggest a plurality of legs extending a second distance from the base. Additionally, with respect to claim 36, *Brunnert* does not teach, show, or suggest a bond strength between the base and the tool is stronger than a bond strength between the adjacent inserts.

With respect to claims 25 and 37, these claims depend from claims 13 and 23, respectively. As discussed above, Applicants believe claims 13 and 23 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants believes claims 25 and 37 are also in condition for allowance. Additionally, *Hall* discloses a two piece insert for attachment to the drill bit. *Hall* further discloses engaging elements for connecting the two pieces of the insert. *Lynde* discloses a one piece insert. There is no motivation to combine the engaging elements of *Hall* to the *Lynde*'s one piece insert. The references, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest a first leg extending from a first portion of the base and a second leg extending from a second portion of the base, wherein the first leg is longer than the second leg, as recited in claims 25 and 37.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

PAGE 10/21 * RCVD AT 3/14/2005 5:51:27 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:7136234844 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-58

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

William B. Patterson
Registration No. 34,102
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

PAGE 11/21 * RCVD AT 3/14/2005 5:51:27 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:7136234844 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-58